



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Janis Davis

Louis Foster

Susan Kairalla

Amado Leon

Claudia Schmid

Eric Tullberg

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW 1 Street, #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SOUTH MIAMI COMMISSION CHAMBERS
6130 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2005
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF AUGUST 24, 2005
- III. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. SNAKE CREEK GREENWAY MASTER PLAN – A. MCCALL, M-DP&R
- IV. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. VENETIAN CSWY. UPDATES
 - B. CARD SOUND RD RESURFACING
 - B. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - C. TENTATIVE 2006 MEETING DATES – D. Henderson
 - D. AUGUST PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella
- VI. MEMBER COMMENTS

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2005

MEMBERS

PRESENT

Sheila Boyce
Barry Burak
Louis Foster
Susan Kairalla
Amado Leon
Ted Silver
Eric Tullberg

MEMBERS

ABSENT

Brett Bibeau
Janis Davis
Claudia Schmid

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Jae Manzella, Staff
Jennifer Blattman, M-DP&R
Andy McCall, M-DP&R
Jeff Cohen, M-DPW
Stewart Robinson, Kimley-Horn
Ignacio Riveira, Everglades Bike Club
Bill Best, Citizen
Pablo Casasnovas, Citizen
Hank Sanchez, Visitor

The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- SK: <i>Motion to approve the agenda; seconded by ET; vote – unanimous.</i>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SK: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of August 24, 2005; seconded by SB; vote – unanimous.</i>
SNAKE CREEK MASTER PLAN	- AM: <i>M-DP&R staff are working to enhance and expand the current Snake Creek Trail.</i> SR: <i>Although the Snake Creek Canal runs from the NW edge of Miami-Dade County to Oleta River, the study team is only focusing on a portion of it: from Miami Gardens Dr., westward to the Florida Turnpike. The canal is identified for improvements in the <u>North Dade Greenways Plan</u>. There have been several bike plans since the 1970's calling for improvements along the canal, a portion of which has been constructed: Snake Creek Park. In the 1990's, the northern bank of the canal was developed. The Army Corps. of Engineers/SFWMD has studied the portion between the Turnpike and NW 37 Av.; but there isn't funding for the bikeway. <i>The M-DP&R project would link what's existing with this future path</i>; comprising a 9-mile trail. The M-DP&R team conducted 3 public meetings, as well as an extensive outreach to various community groups and the cities of Miami Gardens and North Miami Beach.(Various diagrams were presented.) Due to Sky Lake at Miami Gardens Dr., <i>this portion of the trail would only be on the canal's southern side. A trailhead is proposed at this location, where a small parking lot would be constructed, as well as a shelter with picnic tables, an information kiosk, and a canoe launch.</i> This was prescribed in the M-D <u>Blueways Plan</u>. Moving west, where the existing I-95/Tri-Rail underpass is, <i>plans call for a pedestrian overpass.</i> The GO Bond project includes funding for this overpass. However, <i>short-term improvements include reducing the hazards of the underpass by eliminating the steps and adding lighting. West of this, the trail would be on both sides of the canal. Pedestrian bridges along the way would link both sides.</i> Currently, the only way to cross is along high-volume/speed roadways. <i>Existing street ends would serve as neighborhood connections. These would be enhanced with benches, bike racks and information kiosks.</i> The community will benefit, if they take advantage of this recreational corridor as well as the fitness course and playgrounds proposed. <i>In a 2nd phase of the project, Ives Dairy Rd. would be improved with a separate pedestrian bridge.</i> The purpose of phasing is to construct the entire trail corridor at the least possible cost initially; then enhance it. There are already sidewalks which allow crossing the canal at Ives Dairy Rd. <i>A 2nd trailhead is planned near Hwy. 441 at an exiting gravel lot.</i> The community had requested this location to be</i>

	<p>improved. A boat ramp exists there. <i>Fishing platforms will be provided at various locations along the trail.</i> There is insufficient room to create a bridge over the Turnpike, so the study team is proposing an underpass to connect to the future SFWMD project.</p> <p>ET: Inquired why an overpass is planned at I-95., but not Hwy. 441.</p> <p>SR: The GO Bond has funds earmarked for the Ives Dairy Rd. bridge, although a short-term goal is to improve the underpass. Hwy. 441 has signalization to accommodate crossing. <i>Proposed landscaping and materials will be part of the design phase of the project. Asphalt would be used for the path.</i></p> <p>JM: Phasing should include building one side before the other.</p> <p>SR: All of the southern side is in phase 1; and, a portion of the northern side is in phase 2. An existing portion on the southern side already exists; which would be enhanced.</p> <p>JM: Inquired if (defunct golf course) owners will fund the trail on their property.</p> <p>SR: The owners are cooperating and have been in discussion with the study group.</p> <p>JM: Inquired if any communities had voiced opposition to the project.</p> <p>SR: Several groups are very interested in having the project completed. There is a gated community on the NW side of Hwy. 441, which is concerned with the proposed trailhead in this location. It would open their community to outsiders, whom they fear may harm them. The study team reviewed counter-arguments that other communities had used; one of which was NMB, which experienced similar concerns before Snake Creek Park was developed. Their patrol officers attended some meetings, outside of the city boundaries, to ensure that safety would be addressed. Property values were also an issue.</p> <p>ET: Concerned with the detours trail users would have to make at Ives Dairy Rd. and Hwy. 441. Inquired if underpasses could be constructed.</p> <p>SR: While may be possible, they would increase the costs significantly. These would have to be future phases. Currently, the roadways a very close to the water. Due to the lack of signals in these areas, crossing at-grade is not an option.</p> <p>TS: Requested a summary of the proposed timeline.</p> <p>SR: The County currently has the overpass identified for funds, and is pursuing grants. The design could be done in a few months. Construction for phase 1 could take a year.</p> <p>AM: A 90% funding request for construction of phase 1 is being made from the Surface Transportation Program: \$2.25 million. If awarded, these funds would not be available until 2010; however, <i>M-DP&R could spend their own funds prior to that for design.</i></p> <p>JB: If County funds become available, construction could be initiated prior to 2010; then the County could be reimbursed.</p> <p>ET: Inquired, if the study cost \$55,000, how much would the design cost.</p> <p>JB: Around \$250,000.</p> <p>LF: Under the impression that the GO Bonds set a deadline for this project: by 2010.</p> <p>JB: Unaware of any deadline for this or other GO Bond projects; <i>will research this.</i> There was an outline, prior to the vote; and meetings to prioritize projects are underway.</p>
VENETIAN CSWY	<p>- DH: <i>The Chief of the Cswy. Division informed him that the northern westbound toll lane's arm will be shortened to allow cyclists to pass thru,</i> since the sidewalk is too narrow and has a toll mechanism blocking most of the passage.</p> <p>SB: The path has been opened; but the alignment around the toll plaza seems to be ill-conceived. It would have been nice to have it along the waterway.</p> <p>JC: <i>There are plans to plant mangroves in that area.</i></p> <p>JM: The sharp turn wasn't designed for bicyclists when circumnavigating the toll plaza. He is hoping this can be modified. Also, bushes limit sight distance.</p> <p>SB: Agreed; it is confusing.</p> <p>JC: <i>Some striping was done wrong, this will be removed. He will field survey the path</i></p>

	<p><i>alignment. If it can't be modified, then signage to warn cyclists would be installed.</i></p> <p>TS: There have been other designs that M-DPW hasn't provided the proper radii for cyclists. The on-ramp to the Rickenbacker path is another example. Inquired where the problem originates: M-DPW design staff, consultants, review by Mr. Cohen or others.</p> <p>JC: The Rickenbacker on-ramp was installed prior to M-DPW adopting FDOT standards. <i>It will be modified – flatter and longer, to better accommodate cycling.</i> The Venetian path isn't a 90° turn; cyclists will have to slow down to about 5 mph to navigate it.</p> <p>TS: Cyclists will be traveling fast after coming down the bridge. This will be hazardous. Signage is a patch to something that shouldn't have been designed that way.</p> <p>JC: The toll plaza was designed a long time ago; design standards have changed since. Although it has been reviewed since then, it was determined not to modify the original design. Any cyclist would be able to navigate this curve; the guardrail opening has been made extra-wide. It is safer for them to use this path, than go thru the toll booth. It meets current standards. M-DPW wasn't obligated to design the path for fast-riding cyclists. M-DPW currently uses a design-speed of 20 mph when reviewing cycling accommodations.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if the design was done by staff or a consultant; and, if the 20 mph design standard was in-place during that time.</p> <p>JC: Unsure; <i>will have to do research.</i></p> <p>TS: Was informed that sometimes the path is obstructed, or the gates are closed, or parked cars block the (un-functioning) toll lanes.</p> <p>JC: Initially, there was an inconsistency. <i>The path will stay open.</i> An option allowing westbound cyclists to pass thru the northern toll-lane is still being discussed.</p> <p>DH: Has been told that this will be the policy. This opens the argument that cyclists should be provided access thru the (southern) eastbound toll-lane as well. Inquired if progress has been made regarding striping the shoulders as bike lanes.</p> <p>JC: The final design is still being reviewed, particularly where an extra lane is provided along a portion of the causeway. There is a TEP project that coincides with this. <i>In the interim, the shoulders will be marked as bike lanes.</i></p> <p>JM: Suggested signage informing cyclists that they may use the outer-most lanes to ride thru the toll booth, (if the M-DPW decision affirms this).</p>
CARD SOUND RD.	<p>- DH: <i>The structural asphalt portion of the project will be completed by the end of September. Then the final surface will be laid-down in November.</i></p> <p>ET: Inquired if the structural layer is smooth enough to cycle upon.</p> <p>TS: It will be rough. He is concerned that his Nov. 12th ride may be affected.</p> <p>ET: Inquired if there is a shoulder on this roadway.</p> <p>DH: Because the road cuts thru wetlands, there are none.</p> <p>JC: Constructing shoulders would cost multi-millions of dollars; and, would probably not be permitted by environmental agencies. The County has repeatedly asked FDOT to take ownership of this corridor.</p>
PUBLIC WORKS UPDATES	<p>- DH: <i>The Rickenbacker Project Mgr. informed him that bids will start being received today; construction should begin 60 days afterwards.</i></p> <p>JC: A search has begun to fund the BPAC-suggested underpass for the Powell bridge. Road Impact Fees aren't eligible.</p> <p>ET: It could be argued that this is a transit improvement, because it would accommodate bus passengers accessing the beach.</p> <p>JC: This is a possibility. Another concern is M.A.S.T. Academy access from the bus stop. There is a project to reconstruct SW 147 Av., from 8th St. to Bird Rd. M-DPW</p>

	<p>recommended bike lanes to be installed; but the public (at a meeting) was in opposition. Along SW 62 Av., from Tamiami Canal Rd. to Coral Way, the District Commissioner has voice opposition to bike lanes.</p> <p>SB: Inquired how the public can override a Federal/State/County requirement.</p> <p>JC: He was told this is a “maintenance” repair.</p> <p>ET: Inquired about LeJeune Rd. improvements.</p> <p>JC: That is a State road.</p> <p>JM: Inquired about the public’s opposition to other roadway projects, such as widening. There is often opposition, but these projects continue.</p> <p>TS: Although the inclusion of bicycle accommodations is interpreted to be unmandated when repaving/restriping, inquired why the SW 62 Av. project is also unaffected.</p> <p>JC: Unsure of the designated nature of these repairs. However, has been told that Commissioner Sosa is opposed to bike lanes. Doubts a final decision has been made.</p> <p>TS: Inquired how a Commissioner has that discretion.</p> <p>JC: Commissioners have the power to veto any project design.</p> <p>TS: During the Grand Av. project, the MPO made the decision to make an exception to the requirement. They made it clear that this was a “special” exception.</p> <p>JC: Unsure if the SW 62 Av. project qualifies as one for bikeway inclusion.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested Mr. Henderson to bring information to the next meeting regarding this project and the necessity for bikeway considerations. This would include whether the Project Mgr. made a consideration review; whether a single Commissioner can make a decision to exclude bikeways when they are required; as well as to clarify any misconceptions the BPAC may have on the Statutes that require the consideration of bikeways within roadway projects (excluding repaving/resurfacing).</i> This project runs parallel to the Ludlam Trl. project; its ramifications could affect the area. The BPAC’s function is to review these types of projects. If bikeway inclusion is rejected without the BPAC’s knowledge, circumstances leading to these decisions should be made known.</p> <p>JC: Due to ROW limitations, on-street parking and center turn-lane needs, bike lanes were omitted from the new design.</p> <p>TS: An open process, as well as the BPAC ‘s ability to perform its duties is in question.</p>
TENTATIVE 2006 MEETING DATES	- DH: The Agenda pkg. includes the monthly meeting dates for next year’s 4 th Wednesdays, except for November and December, as well as a televised meeting in Downtown Miami with the CTAC and TARC in March. A July recess is intended.
MISCEL- LANEOUS	- ♦ DH: The Biscayne Trl. project along SW 87 Av. isn’t finished. BPAC members have complained about edge-line hazards. <i>These should be eliminated, once the final surface is applied.</i> JC: There have been several meetings between the developer, M-DP&R and M-DPW to ensure safety. The developer’s portion of the bike path was not aligned properly, and <i>modifications will be made to improve it.</i> TS: Inquired when this project would be complete. JC: The developer can only sell an allotted number of houses until they have to finalize the roadway project. It benefits them to complete it. Until then, it is up to them to carryout activities on their own timeline. TS: This has been a source of contention for many cyclists. Those he knows move off the path in this area. <i>It is a hazard; the developer should be required to complete it.</i> DH: One benefit of waiting is due to the amount of construction vehicles that will be using the roadway while homes are built. These can scar the final surface, as was apparent with the 1 st phase of the South Dade Trl.

◆ DH: MDT has a new engineering chief for miscellaneous projects. He had a chance to discuss the M-Path project with him, and *will be asked to attend a BPAC meeting to discuss this and other projects. He said he will field review the M-Path to become familiar with deficiencies.*

◆ HS: *He is planning to live in Miami-Dade County and become an advocate for bicycling.* While living in the San Francisco area, he started a (10-year old), non-profit bicycling group. That area is smaller than Miami-Dade. His group met frequently with politicians, bureaucrats and consultants, accomplishing many successful projects. Nearly 5% of that community cycles regularly. *He is offering his help.* One suggestion is the need for an autonomous group to pressure government. Even in a progressive area like Berkeley, there is still resistance to changing the status quo and considering bicycles. The M-Path needs improvement, although it's a great asset. *He plans to talk to Mr. Henderson, as well as attend BPAC meetings.* He congratulated the BPAC members for their dedication. The peak oil crisis, as well as escalating auto congestion, (the area he lived in is 2nd only to Los Angeles), has been anticipated to wake others up to the choices they make to get around. *The next few years will provide a tremendous opportunity to convert the public.* Although Miami-Dade is flat, a bicycling infrastructure is needed.

BB: Inquired if Mr. Sanchez could site examples that the BPAC could use here.

HS: The immensity of the Bicycle Master Plan is staggering. The development of "bicycle boulevards" is a possibility. He group has been effective in several of these. These roads give priority to cycling, and place cyclists off the heavily-congested parallel roads. A successful network has been developed in Berkley. Traffic circles are becoming more prevalent. Local trips should be a main focus.

TS: *Requested to meet with him to discuss issues.* The BPAC is dealing with a large community with 36 municipalities. The Village of Key Biscayne has been reluctant to become bicycle-friendly, but is now evolving. This area can exert a bigger influence to the entire county. The center of the county is actually around Kendall Dr.

JC: *Requested documentation/plans regarding the development of bicycle boulevards.*

HS: Much of this is on-line. *He will prepare an information sheet for perusal.*

◆ ET: The South Dade Trl. has signage directing cyclists to Bike Route 9 (SW 137 Av./Tallahassee Trl.), yet there isn't a safe connection, and developers are not obliging to connect the two existing facilities. *The BPAC should voice concern over this.*

JC: The original (Tallahassee Trl.) concept was based upon SW 137 Av. remaining a 2-lane road. M-DPW doesn't have an 80' ROW typical cross-section which includes bicycle accommodations. The developer constructed a 4-lane road; and the outside lanes will be wider than normal. ROW would have to be acquired to build bike lanes. The M-DP&Z charrette process is addressing this lack of bicycle accommodations, so future developments may be required to provide enough width for bikeways.

ET: *Recommended narrowing the existing lanes to provide bike lanes.*

JC: This is not possible under the current code.

ET: All the signs direct cyclists to a road which doesn't even have a sidewalk.

JC: It was difficult to even have the FDOT provide a crossing from the South Dade Trl. He was able to convince MDT that buses could make the Speedway a destination, so they asked FDOT for the crossing. *Developers need to be better-integrated with their consultants and the M-DP&Z department to ensure planned bicycle corridors have enough space to build bikeways.*

	<p>◆ ET: A house is being built in Palmetto Bay, and he would like to ensure a sidewalk is part of this development. A review of the site plan doesn't include one, although Village staff agree that a sidewalk is needed. Perhaps the driveway permit could have a stipulation that a sidewalk must be constructed as well. JC: Referred him to Jose Garcia from the Permitting Office.</p> <p>◆ ET: He summarized problems with the South Dade Trl. from Dadeland to SW 264 St. (Copies of data files were provided.) Root damage is a major problem. Debris removal equipment has scarred some of the surface. <i>Also, along SW 77 Av. several sections have sharp turns that need modification for safe bicycle travel, as well as curb-cuts.</i> JC: Sidewalks are not designed for bicycle travel, except in round-a-bouts. ET: Foliage is overgrown in areas; <i>the municipalities should be notified.</i> Sidewalks have been damaged by tree roots in areas. The County maintains much of this roadway. JC: The County was using the FDOT Functional Classification System. After some roadways evolved, the designation became outdated. The County decided to retain all full-section line and half-section line roads. SW 77 Av. in Palmetto Bay is County-owned; he is unsure whether that is the same in Pinecrest.</p> <p>◆ ET: Due to the latest storms, debris has been piled-up on bikeways. <i>Code enforcers should be asked to step-up enforcement.</i> JC: Debris removal is being performed by M-DPW since the hurricane. It is more important to clear roadways first. It is difficult for automobiles to avoid debris at night. ET: In some places the swales are clear, but the bikeways are filled-with debris. TS: It would be difficult to discern who is responsible. Unless there are pictures to document the incident, Team Metro would site the property owner.</p> <p>◆ TS: Mr. Henderson has provided reflective bands for everyone's use.</p>
--	---

- *The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m.*